

1 May 31, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's exceptions
2 are the subject of this proceeding.

3 Appellant works for Washington State University's (WSU's) Housing and Food Services
4 department. Appellant performs routine maintenance and repair duties in the dining halls, stores
5 and for the campus carts and he independently responds to equipment failures in these areas.
6 Appellant is responsible for trouble-shooting equipment problems, repairing equipment, ordering
7 parts, and contacting other skilled-tradespersons for assistance when necessary. During Appellant's
8 work shift, a lead and a supervisor are also on duty, however, Appellant does not routinely contact
9 either of them for assistance or direction.
10

11 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the only difference between the
12 Maintenance Mechanic (MM) II classification and the Facilities Operations and Maintenance
13 Specialist (FOMS) classification is the presence of a supervisor during the work shift. Appellant
14 contends that although a lead and a supervisor are working during his shift, he does not contact
15 them for assistance because they do not have the expertise to perform the repairs. Therefore,
16 Appellant asserts that he works unsupervised which is consistent with the FOMS classification.
17 Appellant further contends that the majority of his work is not assigned by his supervisor or lead,
18 but rather is performed in response to calls from the facilities for emergency assistance. Appellant
19 also argues that WSU has other positions allocated to the FOMS classification that have a lead
20 and/or supervisor on shift.

21 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent agrees with Appellant's description of the
22 level of expertise and independence he uses in the performance of his duties and responsibilities.
23 However, Respondent asserts that the only difference between the MM II classification and the
24 FOMS classification is who has the ultimate responsibility for the work. Respondent contends that
25 because a supervisor is available during Appellant's work shift, the supervisor has the ultimate
26

responsibility for the work being performed and for issues that arise during the shift. Respondent further contends that regardless of whether Appellant seeks assistance, his supervisor is available if necessary.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Maintenance Mechanic II classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Maintenance Mechanic II, class code 5243; and Facility Operations Maintenance Specialist, class code 5221.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

The basic function of the FOMS classification states:

Evaluate equipment operations problems and emergencies in buildings on campuses having multiple buildings which are non-contiguous; take appropriate action to return equipment to its normal operating condition; monitor building systems operations to ensure their normal functioning.

The distinguishing characteristics state:

Single class - no series. Respond to emergency calls and reported malfunctions on mechanical, electrical or utility systems, e.g., elevators, hospital life support systems; apply journey-level knowledge in associated trades; work independently without on-shift supervision and exercise independent judgment to solve problems; call in and coordinate the work of other mechanics during emergencies.

1 Appellant's position fits the basic function of FOMS class. However, because a supervisor and lead
2 are available during Appellant's shift, his position does not fit the distinguishing characteristics for
3 this class.

4 The definition of the Maintenance Mechanic II classification states, “[p]erform skilled work in the
5 operation, maintenance, repair, remodeling, and construction of buildings, grounds, machinery,
6 facilities, and equipment.” The distinguishing characteristics state, “[p]ositions allocated to this
7 class inspect, repair, install, and maintain physical facilities requiring skilled mechanical and trades
8 work. This class requires a good working knowledge of several related skill fields such as
9 electrical, plumbing, carpentry, welding, and machinist work.”

10
11 Appellant's position fits both the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the MM II class.
12 The MM II is a journey-level classification. Therefore, Appellant's expertise and ability to function
13 independently and without supervisory direction is consistent with the intent of this classification.

14 **Conclusion.** Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Maintenance Mechanic II
15 classification and his appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated May 7,
16 2001, should be affirmed and adopted.

17
18 **ORDER**

19 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Mike Burt is denied and the
20 determination of the Director, dated May 7, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

21 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

22 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

23
24 _____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

25 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504